

Weak-Coupling Limit. II

On the Quantum Fokker-Planck Equation

David Taj

Dept. Physics, Politecnico di Torino, C.so Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129, Torino, Italy
david.taj@gmail.com

May 7, 2009

Abstract

In a recent work we have found a contraction semigroup able to correctly approximate a projected and perturbed one-parameter group of isometries in a generic Banach space, in the limit of weak-coupling. Here we study its generator by specializing to W^* -algebras: after defining a Physical Subsystem in terms of a completely positive projecting conditional expectation, we find that it generates a Quantum Dynamical Semigroup. As a consequence of uniqueness and strong generality (well defined dynamics, irrespective of the Physical Subsystem spectral properties or dimensions), its generator deserves to be referred as "the" Quantum Fokker-Planck Equation. We then provide important examples of the limit dynamics, one of which constitutes a new Quantum generalization of the celebrated Fermi Golden Rule.

Introduction

Recently we have studied some weakly-perturbed one-parameter groups of isometries, projected on Banach subspaces [1]. We have found that the projected evolution could be described by a contraction semigroup, under fairly general hypotheses. In particular, no assumption on the subsystem dimensions or spectral properties was made, generalising the results in [2, 3, 4].

For many physical applications however, having a contraction semigroup is certainly not sufficient, as there exists another key fundamental condition that any quantum system must satisfy: that of positivity of the state evolution. Up to date, the need for a correct markovian approximation of a coherent global dynamics, that is able to guarantee the state positivity at

all times, can be found in numerous physical contests, such as that of modeling quantum devices [5], ultrafast spectroscopy in semiconductors [6], phase transitions [7], continuous variable quantum information [8, 9] and quantum open systems [10, 11, 12, 13] to name a few.

Here we continue the study of the contraction semigroup we have found in our previous work, by specializing the Banach spaces to be generic W^* -algebras, in order to be able to address the problem of positivity for the evolution in the most general possible contest (our results can be extended to C^* -algebras without essential changes to our presentation).

It turns out that a key definition to get to our result concerns the very same idea of what a Physical Subsystem is: we should define it to be a projecting completely positive normal conditional expectation on a W^* -subalgebra. This is also interesting from the mathematical point of view itself, as it is a generalization to the non-commutative case of more the standard concept of conditional probability, and has long been shown to be strictly linked with the basic structures of the involved algebra, such as its modular group of automorphisms [14].

As a result, we shall prove that the foretold Contraction Semigroup becomes a Quantum Dynamical Semigroup [15] in case the projected Banach subspace is in fact a Physical Subsystem. This of course is extremely important because it guarantees a positive evolution at all times, together with trace conservation, and thus it becomes immediately applicable to the urgent applicative problems cited above.

After giving a fairly general class of Physical Subsystems, according to our definition, we will discuss and report the explicit limit dynamics of two important examples. The first concerns two or more weakly interacting quantum sectors in a closed setting, contrary to the tensor product structure of open quantum systems. Dissipation here will in fact be possible because information flows irreversibly from the sectors to their polarization space. In the limit of an infinite number of quantum sectors, each sector becomes classically described by a single (positive) occupation probability, and transition rate operators between different sectors boil down to the celebrated Fermi Golden Rule [16]. This motivates the name "Quantum Fermi's Golden Rule" (QFGR) for our example, as the associated dynamics is not a classical Fokker-Planck Equation [17], but rather a Quantum Dynamical Semigroup [15].

The second example is the partial trace over a particle reservoir at thermal equilibrium. This example is new in that we present for the first time the limit dynamics which includes first order contributions, in case no assumption on the subsystem spectral properties are made. This example is easily

generalized to the case of some recently proposed "entangling" projections [11, 12], through what is reported in our previous results in [18].

1 General Framework

We report here the essential features of the general framework we'll be involved with, in order to introduce the basic objects we shall use in the sequel. We suppose that P_0 is a linear projection on a Banach space $\mathcal{B}$, put $P_1 = 1 - P_0$ and $\mathcal{B}_i = P_i\mathcal{B}$, so that

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_0 \oplus \mathcal{B}_1, \quad (1)$$

We suppose that Z is the (densely defined) generator of a strongly continuous one-parameter group of isometries U_t on $\mathcal{B}$ with

$$U_t P_0 = P_0 U_t \quad (2)$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, or equivalently

$$[Z, P_0] = 0 \quad (3)$$

and put $Z_i = P_i Z$. We suppose that A is a bounded perturbation of Z and put $A_{ij} = P_i A P_j$. We let U_t^λ be the one parameter group generated by $(Z + \lambda A_{00} + \lambda A_{11})$, and let V_t^λ be the one parameter group generated by $Z + \lambda A$. Then putting

$$X_t^\lambda = P_0 U_t^\lambda \quad (4)$$

and defining the projected evolution as

$$W_t^\lambda = P_0 V_t^\lambda P_0 \quad (5)$$

and one obtains the all important closed and exact integral equation

$$W_t^\lambda = X_t^\lambda + \lambda^2 \int_0^t ds \int_0^s du X_{t-s}^\lambda A_{01} U_{s-u}^\lambda A_{10} W_u^\lambda. \quad (6)$$

This is nothing but the integrated form of the well known master equation constructed by Nakajima, Prigogine, Resibois, and Zwanzig [19, 20].

To recall the basic results we had in [1], we give the following

Definition 2 For any real positive $T > 0$ put

$$K_T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}T} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt_1 e^{-\frac{t_1^2}{2T^2}} A_{01}(t_1) \int_{-\infty}^{t_1} dt_2 e^{-\frac{t_2^2}{2T^2}} A_{10}(t_2) \quad (7)$$

where we have denoted $A_{ij}(t) = U_{-t} A_{ij} U_t$.

Then we have proven the following

Theorem 2.1 *Suppose that X_t^λ is a one-parameter group of isometries. Suppose that there exists some $0 < c < \infty$ such that for every $\bar{\tau} > 0$*

$$\int_0^{\lambda^{-2\bar{\tau}}} \|A_{01} U_x^\lambda A_{10}\| dx \leq c \quad (8)$$

uniformly on $|\lambda| \leq 1$. Suppose also that for every $0 < \bar{\tau} < \infty$

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int_0^{\lambda^{-2\bar{\tau}}} \|A_{01} (U_x^\lambda - U_x) A_{10}\| dx = 0 . \quad (9)$$

Let $T \in \mathcal{C}([-1, 1], \overline{\mathbb{R}})$ be a real valued positive continuous function on the interval $[-1, 1]$, such that

$$T(\lambda) \sim |\lambda|^{-\xi} \tilde{T}, \quad \lambda \sim 0 \quad (10)$$

for some real positive reference time $\tilde{T} > 0$ and scaling $0 < \xi < 2$. Denote with

$$\widetilde{W}_t^\lambda = \exp\{(Z_0 + \lambda A_{00} + \lambda^2 K_{T(\lambda)})t\} \quad (11)$$

the associated semigroup on $\mathcal{B}_0$.

Then for every $\bar{\tau} > 0$

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \lambda^{-2\bar{\tau}}} \|W_t^\lambda - \widetilde{W}_t^\lambda\| \right\} = 0. \quad (12)$$

Our second important result in [1] was

Theorem 2.2 *If $\|P_0\| = 1$, then $\widetilde{W}_t^\lambda$ is a contraction semigroup on $\mathcal{B}_0$, for all real λ .*

3 The Quantum Fokker-Planck Equation

In this section we will address the problem of positivity concerning the semigroup $\widetilde{W}_t^\lambda$, that approximates the exact projected evolution (6) in the weak coupling limit. In order to do that, we will restrict our attention to the case $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}$ is a W^* -algebra $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}_*)$ with identity, $\mathcal{A}_*$ being the predual, and $\mathcal{B}_0 = \mathcal{X}$ is a W^* -subalgebra with identity [21]. However, we observe that all the results of this section could easily be formulated in the more general C^* -algebraic contest. We start by introducing some fundamental concepts

we shall need in the sequel.

Let $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a linear map between two C^* -algebras $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$. Let $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ denote the $n \times n$ -matrix algebra over $\mathcal{A}$ (same for $\mathcal{B}$). Then Φ induces a map $\Phi_n : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{B})$ defined by

$$\Phi_n(X \otimes E_{ij}) = \Phi(X) \otimes E_{ij}, \quad (13)$$

where $E_{ij}, i, j = 1 \dots n$ are the matrix units spanning $M_n(\mathbb{C})$.

Definition 4 $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is said to be positive if for every $X \in \mathcal{A}$, $\Phi(X^\dagger X) = Y^\dagger Y$ for some $Y \in \mathcal{B}$. Equivalently, Φ is positive if $\Phi(A)$ is positive whenever A is positive. $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is said to be completely positive iff Φ_n is positive for all n .

For sake of completeness we report from [15] the following

Definition 5 Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a W^* -algebra with identity. A Quantum Dynamical Semigroup (QDS) is a one-parameter family of maps Φ_t of $\mathcal{X}$ into itself satisfying

- i) Φ_t is completely positive;
- ii) $\Phi_t(1) = 1$;
- iii) $\Phi_s \Phi_t = \Phi_{s+t}$;
- iv) $\Phi_t(X) \rightarrow X$ ultraweakly, $t \rightarrow 0$, $\forall X \in \mathcal{X}$;
- v) Φ_t is normal (ultraweakly continuous).

Suppose that $L : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is of the form

$$L(X) = i[H, X] - \frac{1}{2}\{A, X\} + \Psi(X), \quad (14)$$

where H is a (unbounded) self-adjoint operator on $\mathcal{X}$, $A \in \mathcal{X}$ is self-adjoint, $\Psi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is completely positive and $\Psi(1) = A$. Then it is very well known [15] that L generates a Quantum Dynamical Semigroup through $\Phi_t = \exp\{Lt\}$.

Now let $\mathcal{X}$ be a W^* -subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}$: we have the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{X} & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{A} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{X}_* & \leftarrow & \mathcal{A}_* \end{array} \quad (15)$$

where $\downarrow$ represent the dualities $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, horizontal arrows are the inclusion and quotient map, $\mathcal{X}_* = \mathcal{A}_*/\mathcal{X}_0$ and $\mathcal{X}_0$ is the polar of $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathcal{A}_*$, defined as

$$\mathcal{X}_0 = \{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_* \mid \langle X, \rho \rangle = 0 \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{X}\}. \quad (16)$$

We report here a slight modification of what is found in [22] in that we require complete positivity:

Definition 6 *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a W^* -subalgebra of a W^* -algebra $\mathcal{A}$. A completely positive normal conditional expectation of $\mathcal{A}$ onto $\mathcal{X}$ is a linear map $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ such that*

- $\Phi(X^\dagger) = \Phi(X)^\dagger$;
- $\Phi(X) = X$ if and only if $X \in \mathcal{X}$;
- Φ is completely positive;
- if $X_1, X_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\Phi(X_1 Y X_2) = X_1 \Phi(Y) X_2$
- $\Phi(X_n) \uparrow \Phi(X)$ whenever $X_n \uparrow X$ ultraweakly

(the term "normal" or "ultraweakly continuous" refers to the this last requirement).

We further define a completely positive projecting normal conditional expectation (CPPNCE) to be a completely positive normal conditional expectation, which is also a projection.

We shall from now on denote the projected $P_0(X)$ with the expectation symbol $P_0(X) = \langle X \rangle$, or $P_0 = \langle \cdot \rangle$, because of our following

Definition 7 *A Physical Subsystem $\mathfrak{X}$ is a triple $\mathfrak{X} = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}, \langle \cdot \rangle)$ where $\mathcal{A}$ is a W^* -algebra, $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a W^* -subalgebra with identity, and $\langle \cdot \rangle : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a CPPNCE.*

Then under suitable natural (and fairly general) hypotheses, we shall show in this section that the semigroup $\widehat{W}_t^\lambda$, defined on a Physical Subsystem $\mathfrak{X} = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}, \langle \cdot \rangle)$, is a Quantum Dynamical Semigroup.

To state the main result of this section, we shall need the following

Definition 8 *For any real ω , the ω -translated dynamically coarse-grained perturbation $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega}$ associated to $H' \in \mathcal{A}$ is given by*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}T(\lambda)}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i\omega t} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2T(\lambda)^2}} H'(t). \quad (17)$$

We shall refer to $\mathcal{L}_\lambda = \mathcal{L}_{\lambda 0}$ simply as dynamically coarse-grained perturbation.

Theorem 8.1 *Let $\mathfrak{X} = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}, \langle \cdot \rangle)$ be a Physical Subsystem.*

Let $U_t = \exp\{Zt\}$ be a one-parameter group of automorphisms on $\mathcal{A}$ generated by an (unbounded) self-adjoint operator H_0 (formally) through

$$Z(X) = i[H_0, X] \quad (18)$$

and assume that $\langle H_0 \rangle$ is an (unbounded) self-adjoint operator on $\mathcal{X}$.

Suppose A is a bounded self-adjoint derivation on $\mathcal{A}$.

Then

- i) $X_t^\lambda = e^{(Z_0 + \lambda A_{00})t}$ is a one-parameter group of automorphisms on $\mathcal{X}$.*
- ii) $\widetilde{W}_t^\lambda = \exp\{(Z_0 + \lambda A_{00} + \lambda^2 K_{T(\lambda)})t\}$ is a Quantum Dynamical Semigroup.*
- iii) Moreover, its generator has the form*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t X &= i[\langle H_\lambda \rangle, X] + i \left[\int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi\omega} \langle (\mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega} - \langle \mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega} \rangle)^\dagger (\mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega} - \langle \mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega} \rangle) \rangle, X \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \{ \langle (\mathcal{L}_\lambda - \langle \mathcal{L}_\lambda \rangle)^2 \rangle, X \} + \langle (\mathcal{L}_\lambda - \langle \mathcal{L}_\lambda \rangle) X (\mathcal{L}_\lambda - \langle \mathcal{L}_\lambda \rangle) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where the (ω -translated) dynamically coarse-grained perturbations $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega}$ are associated to a uniquely defined, up to addition of the identity¹, self-adjoint element $H' \in \mathcal{A}$, and we have put

$$H_\lambda = H_0 + \lambda H'. \quad (20)$$

Proof. First we know [21] that every bounded derivation of a W^* -algebra is inner. Hence there is a $Y \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $A(X) = [Y, X]$. But from $A(X^\dagger) = A(X)^\dagger$ it follows that $Y = iH'$ for a self-adjoint element $H' \in \mathcal{A}$, so that

$$A(X) = i[H', X]. \quad (21)$$

To prove *i)* note that $\langle H' \rangle$ is self-adjoint, as H' is self-adjoint and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is an adjoint map. Then $\langle H_\lambda \rangle = \langle H_0 \rangle + \lambda \langle H' \rangle$ is a (unbounded) self-adjoint operator on $\mathcal{X}$ and

$$X_t^\lambda(X) = e^{i[\langle H_\lambda \rangle, \cdot]t}(X) = e^{i\langle H_\lambda \rangle t} X e^{-i\langle H_\lambda \rangle t} \quad (22)$$

is a one-parameter group of automorphisms on $\mathcal{X}$.

¹Note that substituting $H' \mapsto H' + \alpha 1$ leaves the generator unaffected

The validity of *ii*) follows from *iii*), by just noting that equation *iii*) is in the Lindblad form (14). In fact, both $X \mapsto \langle X \rangle$ and $X \mapsto (\mathcal{L}_\lambda - \langle \mathcal{L}_\lambda \rangle)X(\mathcal{L}_\lambda - \langle \mathcal{L}_\lambda \rangle)$ are completely positive maps (the latter is completely positive since it has the Kraus form [23]), and so is their composition [15]. The remaining requirements $A \in \mathcal{X}$ self-adjoint and $\Psi(1) = A$ following (14) can easily be checked.

To show *iii*), we start putting $K_{T(\lambda)}$ in a more convenient form: we name

$$\Phi^\lambda(t) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}T(\lambda)}} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2T(\lambda)^2}} U_{-t} A U_t \quad (23)$$

and denote as usual $\Phi_{ij}^\lambda(t) = P_i \Phi^\lambda(t) P_j$. Then from

$$\begin{aligned} K_{T(\lambda)} &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_1 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_2 \Phi_{01}^\lambda(t_1) \Phi_{10}^\lambda(t_2) - \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_1 \int_{-\infty}^{t_1} dt_2 \Phi_{01}^\lambda(t_2) \Phi_{10}^\lambda(t_1) \\ K_{T(\lambda)} &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_1 \int_{-\infty}^{t_1} dt_2 \Phi_{01}^\lambda(t_1) \Phi_{10}^\lambda(t_2) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

we sum term by term to obtain

$$K_{T(\lambda)} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_1 \Phi_{01}^\lambda(t_1) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_2 \Phi_{10}^\lambda(t_2) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_1 \int_{-\infty}^{t_1} dt_2 [\Phi_{01}^\lambda(t_1), \Phi_{10}^\lambda(t_2)]. \quad (25)$$

We now introduce

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{K}_{T(\lambda)} &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_1 (\Phi^\lambda - \Phi_{00}^\lambda)(t_1) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_2 (\Phi^\lambda - \Phi_{00}^\lambda)(t_2) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_1 \int_{-\infty}^{t_1} dt_2 (\Phi^\lambda - \Phi_{00}^\lambda)(t_1) (\Phi^\lambda - \Phi_{00}^\lambda)(t_2) \text{sign}(t_1 - t_2), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $(\Phi^\lambda - \Phi_{00}^\lambda)(t) = \Phi^\lambda(t) - \Phi_{00}^\lambda(t)$ and

$$\text{sign}(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & t > 0 \\ 0, & t = 0 \\ -1, & t < 0 \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

is the sign function. Then it follows easily that

$$K_{T(\lambda)} = P_0 \tilde{K}_{T(\lambda)} P_0. \quad (28)$$

Now we write the Fourier representation

$$\text{sign}(t) = i \int \frac{d\omega}{\pi\omega} e^{-i\omega t}, \quad (29)$$

and introduce notation

$$\mathbb{L}_{\lambda,\omega} = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_1 e^{i\omega t} (\Phi^\lambda - \Phi_{00}^\lambda)(t) \quad (30)$$

and $\mathbb{L}_\lambda = \mathbb{L}_{\lambda 0}$, so that we obtain

$$K_{T(\lambda)} = \frac{1}{2} P_0 \mathbb{L}_\lambda^2 P_0 + i \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi\omega} P_0 \mathbb{L}_{\lambda,-\omega} \mathbb{L}_{\lambda,\omega} P_0 \quad (31)$$

In order to compute $K_{T(\lambda)}$, let's also note that for every $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$, and real t ,

$$U_t(XY) = U_t(X)U_t(Y) \quad (32)$$

since U_t is an automorphism. Then it follows easily that

$$A_{ij}(t)(X) = U_{-t} A_{ij} U_t(X) = i P_i([H'(t), P_j(X)]) \quad (33)$$

where in the last line we have defined the interaction picture hamiltonian $H'(t) = U_{-t}(H')$.

We will now consider each factor in (31) separately. Using the definition of the ω -translated dynamically coarse-grained perturbation operators $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega}$, we recognise that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt (\Phi^\lambda - \Phi_{00}^\lambda)(t) (X) = i[\mathcal{L}_\lambda, X] - i\langle[\mathcal{L}_\lambda, \langle X \rangle]\rangle, \quad X \in \mathcal{A}, \quad (34)$$

so we take some $X = \langle X \rangle \in \mathcal{X}$ and compute

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 \mathbb{L}_\lambda^2 P_0(X) &= \langle[\mathcal{L}_\lambda, [\mathcal{L}_\lambda, X]]\rangle - \langle[\mathcal{L}_\lambda, \langle[\mathcal{L}_\lambda, X]]\rangle\rangle \\ &= \langle[\mathcal{L}_\lambda, [\mathcal{L}_\lambda, X]]\rangle - [\langle\mathcal{L}_\lambda\rangle, [\langle\mathcal{L}_\lambda\rangle, X]] \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The second line follows because $\langle\cdot\rangle$ is a conditional expectation, and so for example $\langle[\mathcal{L}_\lambda, X]\rangle = [\langle\mathcal{L}_\lambda\rangle, X]$ (recall that $X \in \mathcal{X}$). Expanding the commutators, this can be written as

$$P_0 \mathbb{L}_\lambda^2 P_0(X) = -\{(\langle\mathcal{L}_\lambda - \langle\mathcal{L}_\lambda\rangle\rangle)^2, X\} + 2\langle(\mathcal{L}_\lambda - \langle\mathcal{L}_\lambda\rangle)X(\mathcal{L}_\lambda - \langle\mathcal{L}_\lambda\rangle)\rangle \quad (36)$$

The second factor in (31) applied to some $X \in \mathcal{X}$, and projected, can be treated with similar calculations to find

$$P_0 \mathbb{L}_{\lambda,-\omega} \mathbb{L}_{\lambda,\omega} P_0 X = \left[\langle(\mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega} - \langle\mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega}\rangle)^\dagger(\mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega} - \langle\mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega}\rangle)\rangle, X \right] \quad (37)$$

Putting the results together, we have computed

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_0 X &= i[\langle H_0 \rangle, X] \\
A_{00} X &= i[\langle H' \rangle, X] \\
K_{T(\lambda)} X &= i \left[\int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi\omega} \langle (\mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega} - \langle \mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega} \rangle)^\dagger (\mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega} - \langle \mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega} \rangle) \rangle, X \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \{ \langle (\mathcal{L}_\lambda - \langle \mathcal{L}_\lambda \rangle)^2 \rangle, X \} + \langle (\mathcal{L}_\lambda - \langle \mathcal{L}_\lambda \rangle) X (\mathcal{L}_\lambda - \langle \mathcal{L}_\lambda \rangle) \rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

showing *iii*) and completing the proof. $\square$

8.1 Comments to the theorem

- Note that, put in this form, $K_{T(\lambda)}$ furnishes a dynamical measure of how much the CPPNCE $\langle \cdot \rangle$ differs from being an algebra homomorphism (as $K_{T(\lambda)} = 0$ in that case), thus giving dynamical information on the nature of the Physical Subsystem $\mathfrak{X}$.
- $\|P_0\| = 1$, in agreement with our previous requirements for the validity of Theorem 2.2. To show this, note that P_0 is a completely positive map on a C^* -algebra and so, according to [24],

$$P_0(X^\dagger)P_0(X) \leq P_0(X^\dagger X). \tag{39}$$

Passing to the norms in case $X = U$ is unitary we obtain (recall P_0 is an adjoint map) $\|P_0(U)\|^2 \leq \|P_0(1)\| = \|1\| = 1$. But then from Corollary 1 in [25] we know that $\|P_0\| = \sup_U \|P_0(U)\|$, where the sup is taken among all unitary operators: since $1_{\mathcal{A}}$ is unitary, it follows that $\|P_0\| = \|P_0(1)\| = 1$.

Through the next Lemma, it will turn out that the hypotheses of last theorem are of quite general nature. Moreover, its results allow the explicit construction of a fairly large number of Physical Subsystems.

Lemma 9 *Let P_0 be a projection on $\mathcal{A}$ of the form*

$$P_0(X) = \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda} V_\alpha^\dagger X V_\alpha \tag{40}$$

for some $\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \subset \mathcal{A}$ and some (possibly uncountable) indexing set Λ . Suppose that P_0 projects onto a W^ -subalgebra $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ and that $1_{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{X}$. Denote with*

$$\mathcal{C} = \{X \in \mathcal{A} \mid [V_\alpha, X] = [V_\alpha^\dagger, X] = 0, \alpha \in \Lambda\} \tag{41}$$

the set of all the elements in $\mathcal{A}$ that commute with each of the V_α and $V_\alpha^\dagger$.
Then $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C}$, and $P_0 : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a CPPNCE.

Proof. It's straightforward to show that $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{X}$. In fact, let $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and evaluate

$$P_0(X) = \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^{\dagger} V_{\alpha} X = X, \quad (42)$$

(the last equality follows from $P_0(1) = 1$, as $1_{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{X}$ and P_0 is a projection), which shows that $X \in \mathcal{X} = \mathfrak{S}(P_0)$.

Then we show that $Y \in \mathfrak{S}(P_0) = \mathcal{X} \Rightarrow Y \in \mathcal{C}$. To this end, take any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, so that $XY \in \mathcal{X}$ because $\mathcal{X}$ is an algebra. Since the restriction $P_0|_{\mathcal{X}}$ is the identity, we have

$$\sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^{\dagger} X Y V_{\alpha} = X Y. \quad (43)$$

Writing this sum as

$$\sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^{\dagger} X Y V_{\alpha} = \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^{\dagger} X V_{\alpha} Y + \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^{\dagger} X [Y, V_{\alpha}] \quad (44)$$

and noting that the first term in the right hand side is nothing but XY , as $X \in \mathcal{X}$ by hypothesis, we conclude that equality (43) amounts to

$$\sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^{\dagger} X [Y, V_{\alpha}] = 0. \quad (45)$$

But this is true for every $X \in \mathfrak{S}(P_0) = \mathcal{X}$, so

$$[Y, V_{\alpha}] = 0 \quad \forall \alpha. \quad (46)$$

We can prove $[Y, V_{\alpha}^{\dagger}]$ in a perfectly analogous manner, so this, together with the ultraweak continuity of (40) (see [21]), shows that $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C}$.

It is then easy to realize that P_0 is a projecting normal conditional expectation, by just checking the requirements in Definition 6 and noting that P_0 has the Kraus form [23] (which guarantees complete positivity). $\square$

The example of CPPNCE reported in the last lemma is fairly general, and for example it includes as a special case, as we shall see, the partial tracing over a bath.

Then, to all extent, the last theorem furnishes enough evidence to consider

$$\partial_t X = (Z_0 + \lambda A_{00} + \lambda^2 K_{T(\lambda)}) X \quad (47)$$

as "the" Quantum Fokker-Planck Equation. In fact, the equation is well defined for every nonzero value of the coupling constant λ , no matter which are the subsystem's nature (that of $\mathcal{X}$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle$), spectral properties (that of Z_0), or dimensions (dimension of the subalgebra $\mathcal{X}$ as a vector space). Moreover, it always gives rise to a (completely positive and trace preserving) Quantum Dynamical Semigroup $\widetilde{W}_t^\lambda$, which is compatible with the exact evolution W_t^λ in the weak-coupling limit (if the convergence hypotheses of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied). As such, it clearly generalizes the preexisting results in [2, 3].

10 Quantum Fermi Golden Rule

The conditions for the validity of the previous theorem are satisfied for a fairly general class of projections P_0 . As a first important example, suppose $\{V_\alpha\}_\alpha$ is a complete set of mutually orthogonal projections on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, so that

$$V_\alpha^\dagger = V_\alpha, \quad V_\alpha V_\beta = \delta_{\alpha\beta} V_\beta \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_\alpha V_\alpha V_\alpha = 1. \quad (48)$$

Take $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}_*) = (B(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}))$, the W^* -algebra of all bounded operators on $\mathcal{H}$, together with the ultraweak topology induced by the predual $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$, the space of trace-class operators on $\mathcal{H}$. It is clear that

$$\mathcal{X} = \{X \in B(\mathcal{H}) \mid \forall \alpha [X, V_\alpha] = 0\} = \left\{ X \in B(\mathcal{H}) \mid X = \sum_\alpha V_\alpha X V_\alpha \right\} \quad (49)$$

is the W^* -subalgebra of box-diagonal elements in $B(\mathcal{H})$. The predual Banach space $\mathcal{X}_*$ is readily identified with

$$\mathcal{X}_* = \{\rho \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}) \mid \rho = \sum_\alpha V_\alpha \rho V_\alpha\}. \quad (50)$$

Define the completely positive projection $P_0(X) = \sum_\alpha V_\alpha X V_\alpha$ on $B(\mathcal{H})$ and note that, because of Lemma 9, it is a (normal) conditional expectation, so that $\mathfrak{X} = (\mathcal{X}, B(\mathcal{H}), P_0)$ is a Physical Subsystem.

Suppose a hamiltonian $H_\lambda = H_0 + \lambda H'$ is given on $\mathcal{H}$, with $[H_0, V_\alpha] = 0$ for all α : then $[Z, P_0] = 0$. After naming $\rho_\alpha = V_\alpha \rho V_\alpha$ for $\rho \in \mathcal{X}_*$ and $X_\alpha = V_\alpha X V_\alpha$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}$, our Quantum Fokker-Planck equation (47) becomes, in

Schroedinger picture, a coupled set of equations of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \rho_\alpha &= -i[H_\alpha + \lambda H'_\alpha + \lambda^2 H''_{\lambda,\alpha}, \rho_\alpha] \\ &- \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{\beta \neq \alpha} \{D_{\lambda\alpha\beta}^\dagger D_{\lambda\alpha\beta}, \rho_\alpha\} + \lambda^2 \sum_{\beta \neq \alpha} D_{\lambda\alpha\beta} \rho_\beta D_{\lambda\alpha\beta}^\dagger \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

with subsystem hamiltonian $H_\alpha = V_\alpha H_0 V_\alpha = V_\alpha H_0$, first order contribution $H'_\alpha = V_\alpha H' V_\alpha$, second order energy renormalization

$$H''_{\lambda,\alpha} = \sum_{\beta \neq \alpha} \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi\omega} V_\alpha \mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega}^\dagger V_\beta \mathcal{L}_{\lambda\omega} V_\alpha \quad (52)$$

and scattering operators

$$D_{\lambda\alpha\beta} = V_\beta \mathcal{L}_\lambda V_\alpha. \quad (53)$$

The operators $D_{\lambda\alpha\beta}$ can be interpreted as "quantum transition amplitudes" among the "quantum populations" $\{\rho_\alpha\}$, that in fact couple the different populations and guarantee positivity of each, as one can easily see.

The generator for $\rho \in \mathcal{X}_*$ in (51) thus constitutes a coupled linear system for density matrices ρ_α . It is certainly of special interest, as the "transition rates" $D_{\lambda\alpha\beta}^\dagger D_{\lambda\alpha\beta}$ between the density matrices ρ_α and ρ_β , with hamiltonians H_α and H_β , furnish a quantum analog of the classical Fermi Golden Rule transition rates [26]

$$\mathcal{P}_{\alpha\beta} = 2\pi H_\beta'^\alpha H_\alpha'^\beta d\alpha \delta(\epsilon_\alpha - \epsilon_\beta) \quad (54)$$

between H_0 eigenstates $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$ with energies ϵ_α and ϵ_β ². Indeed, in the singular, diagonal case $V_\alpha = |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| d\alpha$ (same for β), one could easily see that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} D_{\lambda\alpha\beta}^\dagger D_{\lambda\alpha\beta} = \mathcal{P}_{\alpha\beta} d\beta V_\alpha \quad (55)$$

recovers the Fermi Golden Rule, with the associated classical Fokker-Plank Equation

$$\partial_t f_\alpha = \lambda^2 \int d\beta (\mathcal{P}_{\beta\alpha} f_\beta - \mathcal{P}_{\alpha\beta} f_\alpha). \quad (56)$$

²One normally computes the transition rates for an initial state $|\alpha\rangle$ belonging to the discrete part of the spectrum of H_0 , while $|\beta\rangle$ belongs to its continuum part: to account also for transitions to happen within the continuous part of H_0 , one has to multiply the standard transition rate by the spectral measure $d\alpha$ in $H_0 = \int d\alpha |\alpha\rangle \epsilon_\alpha \langle\alpha|$, to conserve dimensions and avoid singularities.

Note that this example is peculiar to the case $\mathcal{B}_0$ is not finite dimensional and Z_0 has (also) continuous spectrum. In fact, only in these conditions one can hope to show that

$$\int_0^\infty \|A_{01}U_t A_{10}\| dt < \infty, \quad (57)$$

which is a necessary requirement for all the theorems on the weak limit we have proven. Physically, one could say that only when the spectrum of the free hamiltonian is continuous, the "off-diagonal polarizations" $V_\alpha \rho V_\beta$ ($\alpha \neq \beta$) contain enough (in fact an infinite number of) degrees of freedom, to allow an exponential decay solution instead of Bloch oscillations. As it is, equation (51) could thus be addressed as a "Quantum Fermi's Golden Rule" (QFGR), as the "quantum populations" ρ_α are (positive definite) density matrices rather than (positive) real numbers representing the eigenstates $|\alpha\rangle$ populations.

This deserves a comment: there are many proposed quantum generalization of the well known Fermi's Golden Rule [10, 16], which are robust and physically and mathematically meaningful. All these generalizations consider a bipartite system: nevertheless, the original idea by Fermi, stated in modern terms, was rather to take a global system and project on the space of density matrices, that are diagonal in the basis of the unperturbed hamiltonian. His motivations referred to the fact that the system eigenvalues are "robust" against dissipation, and thus constitute the relevant degrees of freedom. Just along these lines, no environment (system "B") is present in our model of the QFGR. The possibility to obtain a QDS comes exactly by the fact that the unperturbed hamiltonian has continuous spectrum, thus conferring our QFGR version an autonomous relevance.

We believe that our QFGR equation could be applied in numerous topical and important cases in the next future, to study dissipation, decoherence and quantum noise among weakly interacting continuous quantum subsectors of a given system.

11 Partial Tracing over a Heat Bath

What we say here for a system "A" coupled to a bath "B" holds for the general case of Quantum Open Systems, that is, one could easily implement more reservoirs at different temperatures (for an interesting and important generalization of this case see [18] and references therein).

The projection P_0 we are going to define is informally referred to as "tracing away the bath degrees of freedom". Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ be the tensor

product of two Hilbert spaces and denote with $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{K})$ the space of trace-class operators on $\mathcal{K}$. Now $\tilde{P}_0 : \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ is uniquely determined by

$$\text{Tr}(\tilde{P}_0(\rho)X) = \text{Tr}(\rho(X \otimes 1_B)) \quad (58)$$

for arbitrary $\rho \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ and bounded operator X on $\mathcal{H}_A$. If a (normal) state $\omega \geq 0$, $\text{Tr}(\omega) = 1$, is given on $\mathcal{H}_B$, then $\overline{P}_0\rho = \tilde{P}_0(\rho) \otimes \omega$ is a projection in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ with image isomorphic to $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)$, called the partial trace.

Let $\{\phi_\alpha\}$ be a basis for $\mathcal{H}_B$ and define the operators

$$V_{\alpha\beta} = 1_A \otimes \sqrt{\omega}|\phi_\beta\rangle\langle\phi_\alpha| \quad (59)$$

on $\mathcal{H}$. Then

$$\overline{P}_0\rho = \sum_{\alpha\beta} V_{\alpha\beta}\rho V_{\alpha\beta}^\dagger. \quad (60)$$

Now set $\mathcal{A} = B(\mathcal{H})$, and define P_0 on $\mathcal{A}$ through

$$P_0X = \sum_{\alpha\beta} V_{\alpha\beta}^\dagger X V_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (61)$$

It's easy to check that P_0 is a completely positive linear projection, and also an ultraweakly continuous conditional expectation, on the W^* -algebra $\mathcal{A} = B(\mathcal{H})$ with predual $\mathcal{A}_* = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$. Then the W^* -subalgebra $\mathcal{X}$ of operators on $\mathcal{H}$ that commute with each $V_{\alpha\beta}^{(\dagger)}$ (see Lemma 9) is precisely

$$\mathcal{X} = \{\tilde{X} \in B(\mathcal{H}) \mid \tilde{X} = X \otimes 1_B \text{ for some } X \in B(\mathcal{H}_A)\} \sim B(\mathcal{H}_A). \quad (62)$$

The polar $\mathcal{X}_0$ of $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathcal{A}_* = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ is thus

$$\mathcal{X}_0 = \{\rho \in \mathcal{A}_* \mid \text{Tr}(\rho X \otimes 1) = 0 \ \forall X \in B(\mathcal{H}_A)\}, \quad (63)$$

so that from

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \sigma \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_B) \\ \text{Tr}(\sigma) = 1 \end{array} \right\} \implies \sum_{\alpha} \rho_{\alpha} \otimes \sigma_{\alpha} - \left(\sum_{\alpha} \text{Tr}(\sigma_{\alpha}) \rho_{\alpha} \right) \otimes \sigma \in \mathcal{X}_0 \quad (64)$$

we see that $\mathcal{X}_* = \mathcal{A}_*/\mathcal{X}_0$ can easily be identified with $\mathcal{X}_* = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)$.

In particular, we see that the projection $\overline{P}_0$ could be used to pass to the quotient through $\rho_1 \sim \rho_2$ in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ if and only if $\overline{P}_0(\rho_1) = \overline{P}_0(\rho_2)$ (alternatively, one could put $\tilde{P}_0(\rho) = [\rho]_{\sim} \in \mathcal{X}_*$). Our Physical Subsystem can thus be identified with $\mathfrak{X} = (B(\mathcal{H}_A), B(\mathcal{H}), P_0)$.

To discuss the dynamics, suppose σ_β is the bath density matrix at thermal equilibrium at inverse temperature β , and suppose we are given a hamiltonian on $\mathcal{H}$ of the form

$$H_\lambda = H_A \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes H_B + \lambda H_I \quad (65)$$

with interaction

$$\lambda H_I = Q \otimes \Phi \quad (66)$$

where Q and Φ are (bounded) self-adjoint operators on the respective spaces. Since $[H_B, \sigma_\beta] = 0$ it follows that $[U_t, P_0] = 0$. Name the bath correlation function as

$$h(t) = \text{Tr}(\sigma_\beta e^{iH_B t} \Phi e^{-iH_B t} \Phi) \quad (67)$$

and let

$$\hat{h}(\omega) = \int \frac{dt}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{i\omega t} h(t) \quad (68)$$

denote its Fourier transform. Call also

$$\bar{h} = \text{Tr}(\sigma_\beta \Phi) = \text{Tr}(\sigma_\beta \Phi_t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R} \quad (69)$$

the first order contribution. Then upon identifying $\mathcal{X} \sim B(\mathcal{H}_A)$ one has $Z_0 X = i[H_A, X]$, $A_{00} X = i\bar{h}[Q, X]$, and one computes

$$\begin{aligned} K_{T(\lambda)} X &= \int \frac{d\omega}{\sqrt{2\pi}} (\hat{h}(\omega) - \sqrt{2\pi} \bar{h}^2 \delta(\omega)) \left(i \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi\omega'} [Q_{\omega+\omega', \lambda}^\dagger Q_{\omega+\omega', \lambda}, X] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \{ Q_{\omega, \lambda}^\dagger Q_{\omega, \lambda}, X \} + Q_{\omega, \lambda}^\dagger X Q_{\omega, \lambda} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Here we have defined the operators $Q_{\omega, \lambda}$ as

$$Q_{\omega, \lambda} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} T(\lambda)}} \int dt e^{-t^2/2T(\lambda)^2} e^{i\omega t} Q_t \quad (71)$$

and $Q_t = U_{-t}(Q)$ is the interaction picture subsystem hamiltonian at time t . Note that the presence of first order contributions manifests itself in that, with physical and diagrammatical terminology, only "connected" correlation functions appear: the term $\hat{h}(\omega) - \sqrt{2\pi} \bar{h}^2 \delta(\omega)$ is in fact related, through Fourier Transform, to the connected bath correlation function

$$\text{Tr}(\sigma_\beta (\Phi_{t_1} - \bar{h}1)(\Phi_{t_2} - \bar{h}1)) = h(t_1 - t_2) - \bar{h}^2. \quad (72)$$

This generalizes the example in [2] in that the "atom" in system A needs not be N -dimensional, nor does Z_0 need to have discrete spectrum, and runs completely counter the common idea that a "small subsystem" is implemented by its Hilbert space being finite dimensional. Rather, the subsystem is small if the boundedness hypothesis (8) and (9) hold true, indicating a fast information flow (faster than second order) from the Physical Subsystem to the remaining degrees of freedom (see [2] for conditions on the correlation function h to satisfy these hypotheses).

Note also that this example generalizes the preexisting literature in that it takes first order corrections into account.

As a final important observation, we note that if $\mathcal{H}_A$ is finite dimensional, then if suitable ergodic conditions on the projected perturbation Q are satisfied (see [27]) we know that for all real λ there exists a unique steady state ρ_∞^λ for the dual of $W_t^\lambda = \exp\{(Z_0 + \lambda A_{00} + \lambda^2 K_{T(\lambda)})t\}$ in $\mathcal{X}_* \sim \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)$, and that this state is faithful. If moreover we assume $A_{00} = 0$, the steady state analysis in [2], plus a straightforward use of Laplace transforms, imply that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \rho_\infty^\lambda = \frac{e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}_A}}{\text{Tr}(e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}_A})} \quad (73)$$

gives the density matrix at thermal equilibrium, at the heat bath inverse temperature β . This obviously leads one to conjecture that although the limit dynamics may not be defined at $\lambda = 0$, still the limit steady state(s) $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \rho_\infty^\lambda$ may exist and provide important physical information (uniqueness being linked to the question of phase transition).

Summary and Conclusion

In a recent paper by us we have found a contraction semigroup able to correctly approximate a projected and perturbed one-parameter group of isometries in a generic Banach space, in the limit of weak-coupling. Here we have specialized to what we have defined to be a Physical Subsystem, where the projected subspace is a W^* -subalgebra, given in terms of a (completely positive) projecting normal conditional expectation. With this very general and natural requirement we have proven that the contraction semigroup specializes to a Quantum Dynamical Semigroup, thus guaranteeing all important physical properties like positivity and trace conservation.

After reporting a fairly general class of Physical Subsystems, according to our definition, we have discussed the limit dynamics of two important and new examples, the first being a Quantum version of the celebrated Fermi

Golden Rule, and the second being the partial tracing over a thermal bath, in case of a general spectrum for the free subsystem dynamics, as well as in the presence of first order terms.

Our results are of very general nature, and open the way to the study of a variety of different extensions (beyond second order, time dependent free dynamics, Boltzmann equation, to name a few) and applications in the fields of continuous variables quantum open systems, quantum information, phase transitions and mesoscopic physics, and allow future investigations of irreversibility and decoherence in more abstract quantum theories.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Prof. Fausto Rossi (NTL, Phys. Dept., Politecnico of Turin) for profound and enlightening discussions on all the important concepts in this work. We would like to thank Prof. Hisao Fujita Yashima (Dept. Mathematics, University of Turin) for having offered so many days of invaluable help and discussions to the author.

References

- [1] D.Taj, *Weak-Coupling Limit. I: A Contraction Semigroup for Infinite Subsystems*, arXiv:0905.1012v1 [quant-ph] (2009)
- [2] Davies, E.B., *Markovian Master Equations* (Commun. math. Phys. 39, 91–110 (1974))
- [3] Davies, E.B., *Markovian Master Equations II* (Math. Ann. 219, 147–158 (1976))
- [4] Dmcke, R. and Spohn H., *The Proper Form of the Generator in the Weak Coupling Limit*, Z. Physik B, 34, 419-422 (1979)
- [5] Iotti R.C., Ciancio E., Rossi F., *Quantum transport theory for semiconductor nanostructures: A density-matrix formulation*, Phys. Rev. B, 72, 125347 (2005)
- [6] See, e.g., F. Rossi and T. Kuhn, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 895 (2002).
- [7] Sachdev, S., *Quantum Phase Transitions*, Cambridge University Press (1999)

- [8] Bouwmeester D., Pan, J.-P., Mattle K., Eibl M., Weinfurter, H. and Zeilinger, A., *Nature* 390, 575 (1997)
- [9] Grosshans, F., Van Assche, G., Wenger, J., Brouri, R., Cerf, N. J. and Grangier P., *Nature* 421, 238 (2003).
- [10] Attal, S., Joye, A., Pillet, C.-A., *Open Quantum Systems I, II and III*, LNM, Vol. 1880-1882, 2006
- [11] Breuer, H.P., *Non-Markovian generalization of the Lindblad theory of open quantum systems*, *Phys. Rev. A* 75, 022103 (2007).
- [12] Vacchini, B., *Non-Markovian dynamics for bipartite systems*, *Phys. Rev. A*, 78, 022112 (2008).
- [13] Breuer, H. P., Petruccione, F., *The theory of open quantum systems*, Oxford University Press, 2002.
- [14] Golodets, V. Ya. *Conditional expectation and modular automorphisms of von Neumann algebras*, *Functional Analysis and Its Applications*, Volume 6, Number 3 (1972)
- [15] Lindblad, G., *On the Generators of Quantum Dynamical Semigroups* *Commun. math. Phys.* 48, 119–130 (1976)
- [16] Fermi E., *Nuclear Physics*, University of Chicago Press (2005).
- [17] Risken, H., *The Fokker-Planck Equation*, Springer Verlag, New York, (1988).
- [18] Taj, D. and Rossi, F., *Completely positive markovian dynamics in the weak-coupling limit*, *Phys. Rev. A* 78, 052113 (2008)
- [19] Nakajima, S., *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 20, 948 (1958).
- [20] Zwanzig, R., *J. Chem. Phys.* 33, 1338 (1960).
- [21] Sakai S., *C*-algebras and W*-algebras*, ISBN 3540636331, 9783540636335, Springer, 1998
- [22] Davies, E.B., *Quantum Theory of Open Systems*, Academic Press, London (1976).
- [23] Kraus, K., *Ann. Phys.* 64, 311-335 (1970)

- [24] Stormer, E., Springer Lecture Notes in Physics 29, 85-106 (1974)
- [25] Russo, B, Dye, H.A., Duke Math. J. 33, 413-416 (1966)
- [26] Alicki, R., *The Markov Master Equations and the Fermi Golden Rule*, International Journal of Theoretical Physics, Vol. 16, No. 5 (1977), pp. 351-355
- [27] Frigerio, A., *Quantum dynamical semigroups and approach to equilibrium*, Lett. Math. Phys., 2, (1977) 79-87.